

Loan of Naval Vessels

October 22, 1965

pared to testify to anything that the Government wanted him to testify to if "he could be sprung."

What was Edward Grady Partin facing when he told the district attorney in Baton Rouge that he had evidence that would get Hoffa?

Here are the facts.

On October 5, 1962, Edward Grady Partin, a Teamster official in Baton Rouge, La., lay in jail facing the following charges:

First. Forgery of a union withdrawal card. Trial date had been set for October 23 in district court.

Second. Embezzlement and falsifying records, 26 counts in all, 13 of falsifying records and 13 of embezzlement. Partin was expecting to go to trial in the Federal court and could have been fined \$260,000 and sentenced to 78 years in prison on these counts.

Third. Manslaughter—Partin also faced first degree manslaughter and leaving the scene indictments in the State of Alabama.

Fourth. Kidnapping—Partin was under indictment on the charge of aggravated kidnapping and trial had been set for the jury week of November 12 in district court.

Three damage suits totaling \$400,000 were also pending against Partin in connection with the Alabama incident which was the basis of the manslaughter indictment.

Two days later, October 7, 1962, Partin walked out of jail. He has not been back. Today he is the secretary-treasurer of Local No. 5 of the Teamsters Union in Baton Rouge, La.

On October 5, 1962, when Partin lay in jail over these multiple, serious indictments and facing civil suits claiming heavy damages, his prospects were further darkened by a New York bonding company revoking his \$50,000 bailing bond. Two days later Partin went free on three new bonds totaling \$60,000. In the following 2 weeks the trials of Partin on various charges were postponed by Government request.

Evidence by Justice Department Lawyer A. Frank Grimsley, at the Chattanooga trial, makes it plain that Partin's sudden change of fortune took place after he had contacted the Justice Department in late September through a police investigator. Grimsley testified that he met Partin "at least two times. Possibly three." These conferences Grimsley admitted, under strong cross-examination, "probably started in late September (1962)." Grimsley made no bones about the matter that Partin was operating as a Federal undercover agent in the Hoffa case the day after he was released from jail. On the day, October 8, 1962, Partin made a telephone call to Hoffa in Newark, N.J. The telephone call, with Partin's cooperation but unknown to Hoffa, was recorded by Justice Department investigators. The tape recording of the telephone conversation became a part of the record of the Chattanooga trial. Why did the Justice Department introduce that record after Partin had left the witness stand and leave defense attorneys unable to ques-

tion Partin about this basic and critical piece of evidence?

In the course of the October 8 telephone call Partin requested to see and discuss with President Hoffa the problems of his Baton Rouge Teamster local. Partin came to Nashville, where Hoffa was about to go on trial, and stayed for 2½ months. He ingratiated himself into the inner counsel of the Hoffa group, listened in on consultations between Hoffa and his lawyers, and even—according to sworn testimony—made suggestions to Hoffa lawyers that they appoint him (Partin) to take part in extra-legal activities in order to help Hoffa. These suggestions by Partin were rebuffed, Teamster lawyer William Bufalino testified.

Throughout his period Partin reported regularly to Justice Department lawyers who worked on the prosecution of Mr. Hoffa. Does not the record of the Chattanooga trial support 100 percent the defense contention that Partin was a paid informer of the Justice Department planted upon the defendant and his lawyers?

THE PARTIN RECORD

What sort of a man was Edward Grady Partin that the U.S. Justice Department should grant his immunity from a series of felony prosecutions and then present him as the key witness in a most important national trial?

Partin has other criminal records besides the indictments for embezzlement, falsifying records, forgery, kidnapping and manslaughter which stood against him at the time the Justice Department employed him. In 1943, Partin was sentenced in the State of Washington to serve 15 years for burglary. He twice escaped from jail during the serving of the sentence. FBI records show Partin—FBI No. 2249716—was arrested some 15 times between 1941 and 1948 on a variety of charges including burglary, robbery, and auto theft, larceny, theft, robbery with firearms, etc. When faced with this record by Hoffa attorneys, Partin, on the witness stand, pleaded, "I don't remember, I certainly don't." Partin insisted he had no memory of his burglary conviction and 15-year sentence but finally conceded " * * * it must have been it, I don't remember the name of the place or who was there or whatever it was." Is it not ironical that the prosecutor in the Hoffa trial rested his case largely upon the claim that this same man, Partin, could recall in exact detail conversations he had had with Hoffa a year earlier?

PERJURY CHARGES WARRANTED

During the Hoffa trial in Chattanooga, both Partin and Walter Sheridan of the Justice Department swore under oath that Partin had not been compensated in any way for his service as a Justice Department informer. The judge asked Partin:

Was there any arrangement for the Government paying any of your expenses and compensating you in any way in your trip to Nashville?

Partin answered:
No, sir.

Sheridan was asked by Hoffa defense counsel:

Have you ever authorized any payment to Mr. Partin?

Sheridan answered:

No, sir.

Sheridan then denied that any promise had ever been made to Mr. Partin. The defense then produced a confidential memorandum of the Justice Department which authorized the payment of \$300 a month to Partin's wife for an extended period of time. Partin admitted that these payments were made in return for his service to the Government. Agent Grimsley also admitted that the arrangement was to make a flat payment of \$300 a month indirectly to Mr. Partin.

WAS CAUSE OF JUSTICE SERVED?

I have laid out in some detail here the facts on Edward Grady Partin and his relationship to the Justice Department and his role in the Hoffa trial in Chattanooga.

I raise the question of the character and activities of Partin because, to me, they go to the root of the problem of how the quality of justice is affected once confidential funds are set up inside the Justice Department to hire paid informers.

To what extent has Federal law enforcement become a law unto itself?

In what prosecutions is the order given "no holds barred?"

What standards are considered before a decision is taken to use the services of a paid informer?

What pressures are felt before a decision is taken to use a paid informer who is already a convicted felon and is under indictment and near to trial for an alleged series of other felonies?

What funds are presently available for this purpose?

The House Judiciary Committee passed a resolution, by a vote of 20 to 13, almost a year ago, calling for an investigation into the operations of the Justice Department. Almost a year has gone by since that resolution was passed but no funds have been authorized and no staff has been obtained to conduct this inquiry.

The facts I have outlined about Mr. Partin and his relationships with the Justice Department are, to me, strong evidence that action is required in this case. Among other things, I think that an inquiry should go into the following questions:

First. Was a deal made between the Justice Department and Partin?

Second. If so, what are the terms of that deal and how do they reflect upon the standards by which the Justice Department operates?

Third. If no deal was made, then why has there been no prosecution of Partin in the courts on the indictments that he was under over 3 years ago?

AUTHORIZING LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. FISHER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of

(Mr. MURPHY of New York was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MURPHY of New York's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MURPHY of New York was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MURPHY of New York's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CAREY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CAREY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CAREY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CAREY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CAREY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 192, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, certain events of the past few weeks concerning Edward Grady Partin, admitted informer in the Hoffa case, raise questions of serious concern to me regarding the administration of justice in the United States.

It has come to my attention that one of the Partin indictments which was pending against him at the time he volunteered to become an informer for the United States, first-degree manslaughter and leaving the scene of an accident in the State of Alabama—was nolle prossed. Ten days later, the Alabama jury in the civil case awarded a verdict of \$150,000 in damages to the mother of the young airman who was killed in the accident which led to the manslaughter charge and from which Partin fled and attempted to conceal his automobile causing the accident.

Another indictment against Partin which was pending at the time he became a Government informer involving 26 counts of embezzlement of union funds and falsifying records in violation of the Landrum-Griffin Act is still pending.

I am not concerned with Edward Grady Partin as such nor am I assessing the guilt or innocence of James R. Hoffa. I am concerned, however, with a system of law enforcement in which the Government participates in rendering an individual immune from prosecution for alleged crimes committed in return for cooperating in "getting" another person.

Serious questions arise surrounding the circumstances of Partin's continued immunity:

Why was Partin released from his Baton Rouge cell where he was incarcerated because his bail bond had been canceled?

Why has the Department of Justice granted him its protective mantle when he was faced with at least three lifetimes in jail under the four indictments that were then pending against him?

Why does the Department of Justice continue to afford Edward Grady Partin the protection of U.S. marshals even when he is engaged in racing automobiles in various States in the Union?

Why does Partin receive the protection of marshals while he is engaged in a strike at this very moment with Bulk Transport in Louisiana and where Partin and his local have been enjoined from all picketing because of the violence that has erupted in the course of the strike?

Why should U.S. marshals be provided at taxpayers' expense in a situation where attempts have been made to blow up gas tanks, where the cabs of trucks have been riddled with bullets, where drivers have been severely beaten?

Why should this protection be afforded at taxpayers' expense when we have lost marshal protection in southern Illinois?

Why does the State of Alabama refuse to intervene in prosecuting Partin in a case which has already resulted in a damage suit of \$150,000 assessed against Partin and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters?

Why did the Department of Justice avidly seek the indictment of Partin on 26 counts of Landrum-Griffin violations encouraging witnesses to appear before the grand jury at the risk of their lives for testifying against Partin and now engages in a series of requests for postponement of the trial for an indefinite period?

A major purpose of the Landrum-Griffin law in 1959 was to protect the rank-and-file trade union member against misuse of his union dues by union officers. The Justice Department supported passage of that legislation. They asserted that it was urgently required. Yet here we have the Justice Department sitting for over 3 years on 26 counts of an indictment for embezzlement and falsification of union accounts against a trade union official.

Today that official is still operating as the secretary-treasurer of local No. 5 of the Teamsters Union.

Yet, this man, Edward Partin, is alleged to be an embezzler. At least, that is the view of a grand jury which looked long and hard into his affairs. Thirteen counts of embezzlement were handed down against him. Was not the Landrum-Griffin law passed, in part, because of allegations of corruption being backed up by violence to silence internal critics where embezzlement of union funds was taking place? Such specific allegations have been made in regard to Partin's local. The two chief critics of Partin, and the early voices to allege the embezzlement which was confirmed by the grand jury, were set upon and savagely beaten as a reward for their vigilance. A 600-pound safe, with all the local's books and records then disappeared from the union hall and was found empty in the river. One of Partin's two major critics was killed in an unusual industrial accident.

Is this not the pattern of events that we set out to cure in 1959 by passage of the Landrum-Griffin law? Then the Justice Department said "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." We gave them the tools but they have lain down on the job.

What use is it for us here and for our friends in the other body to hold hearings, to write reports, to attend debates and to work to perfect a law to minimize trade union corruption if that law is not going to be enforced in so flagrant a case as this? Here we have 13 counts of embezzlement, 13 more counts of falsifying accounts, records have been destroyed, critics have been beaten and one has even been silenced forever by a strange accident, yet—for more than 3 years now—the indictments have been in suspense.

There is an affidavit alleging that Partin told a cellmate that he was pre-

naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1208)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
MELVIN PRICE,
O. C. FISHER,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
JOHN STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

BACKGROUND

House action

On August 30, 1965, the House passed the following three ship loan bills:

H.R. 7811, which would authorize the loan or sale of ships to South American countries as follows: Argentina, three destroyers; Brazil, four destroyers; Chile, two destroyers; Peru, two destroyers; Venezuela, one submarine.

H.R. 7812, which would authorize the loan of ships to Italy and Spain as follows: Italy, two submarines; Spain, one helicopter carrier.

H.R. 7813, which would authorize the loan of ships to China, Turkey, and the Philippines as follows: China, one destroyer and two destroyer escorts; Turkey, two destroyers; the Philippines, one destroyer escort.

Senate action

The Senate passed only one bill, H.R. 7812. As amended, the Senate bill included all of the House version of H.R. 7812 and parts of H.R. 7811 and H.R. 7813 as follows:

Country	House bill	Senate bill
Argentina.....	3 destroyers.....	2 destroyers.
Brazil.....	4 destroyers.....	3 destroyers.
Chile.....	2 destroyers.....	Eliminated.
Peru.....	do.....	Do.
Venezuela.....	1 submarine.....	Do.
Italy.....	2 submarines.....	2 submarines.
Spain.....	1 helicopter carrier.....	1 helicopter carrier.
China.....	1 destroyer and 2 destroyer escorts.	Eliminated.
Turkey.....	2 destroyers.....	2 destroyers.
Philippines.....	1 destroyer escort.....	1 destroyer escort.

In summary, then, the Senate action eliminated China, Chile, Peru and Venezuela and would permit one less ship each to Argentina and Brazil.

Conference action

Prior to the conference, it became evident that a full and free exchange of views be-

tween the Senate and House conferees was impossible in view of the parliamentary situation. Briefly stated, the Senate through its action in selecting only one of the three House bills for amendment and passage precluded the insertion by the conferees of any of the countries not included in the original version of H.R. 7812 as passed by the House. No meaningful discussion could be had, therefore, with respect to China, Chile, Peru or Venezuela, these countries having appeared in either H.R. 7811 or H.R. 7813.

Notwithstanding the inhibiting character of the parliamentary situation, the conferees agreed that they should meet and, regardless of the inadvertently created technical difficulty, discuss the total program of ship loans originally submitted by the executive branch.

The House conferees agreed that in view of the importance of the ship loan program, the Senate version of the bill should be accepted. The only alternative, in view of the imminence of the adjournment of Congress, would be no ship loan legislation at all. This was a wholly unacceptable eventuality.

The House recedes.

It was agreed in conference that the Senate conferees will give serious and sympathetic consideration to the ship loan program as passed by the House early in the next session of the Congress.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
MELVIN PRICE,
O. C. FISHER,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of yesterday, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the statement.

Mr. FISHER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with and it be printed at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman as to whether there is any provision for the loan of these destroyers to the South American country of Peru.

Mr. FISHER. There is nothing in the pending bill or in the conference report for Peru, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I am advised the Peruvian Navy has chased our fishing vessels. I am very glad we are not turning any destroyers over to them so that they can use them to apprehend our vessels and take them into custody. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the same query for informational purposes about the submarine, I believe it was, that was in this bill, for Venezuela. Has that been removed?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I will advise the gentleman that there is nothing in the conference report regarding the loan of any vessels to Venezuela.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, because with what they have taken from the American investors in Venezuela in recent months I am sure they should not be in a position, for mutual protection or any other reason, of being given unusual ships of our Navy at this time. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 309)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

This report to the Congress describes a 6-month period of impressive accomplishment by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In a larger sense, however, this report describes America on the move.

The story of man's advancement through the ages is the story of man's victory over the forces of nature. The health and comfort he enjoys, the leisure he possesses, and the abundance of the food he eats are all the result of his unending determination to probe the secrets of the world around him.

In 1958, it was my privilege to introduce the legislation to create the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I stated then:

I confidently believe that the developments of the space age will bring the beginning of the longest and greatest boom of abundance and prosperity in the history of man.

Time is bearing out that belief.

And so I take pleasure in submitting this report to Congress. It chronicles a great and exciting period of accomplishment and foreshadows an even greater one. In commending this record, I also commend the men principally responsible for making it possible. Dr. James Webb and Dr. Hugh Dryden have guided and directed our Nation's space program for nearly 5 years—and they have a grateful nation in their debt.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

WHITE HOUSE, October 22, 1965.

October 22, 1965

27540

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

According (at 8 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 9 o'clock p.m.

AMENDING AND EXTENDING THE PROVISIONS OF THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

Mr. COOLEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, which was ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1209)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Sugar Act Amendments of 1965'.

"Sec. 2. Section 201 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out of the first sentence the words 'month of December in' and substituting the words 'last three months of'; and (2) by striking out of the second sentence 'October 31' and substituting 'September 30'.

"Sec. 3. Section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Paragraphs (1) and (2) (A) of subsection (a) are amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) For domestic sugar-producing areas, by apportioning among such areas six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, as follows:

"Area	Short tons, raw value
Domestic beet sugar	3,025,000
Mainland cane sugar	1,100,000
Hawaii	1,110,000
Puerto Rico	1,140,000
Virgin Islands	15,000

Total..... 6,390,000

"(2) (A) To or from the above total of six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, there shall be added or deducted, as the case may be, an amount equal to 65 per centum of the amount by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds ten million four hundred thousand short tons, raw value, or is less than nine million seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value. Such amount shall be apportioned between the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area on the basis of the quotas for such areas established under paragraph (1) of this subsection and the amounts so apportioned shall be added to, or deducted from the quotas for such areas."

"(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the Republic of the Philippines, in the amount of one million and fifty thousand short tons, raw value, plus 10.86 per centum of the amount, not exceeding seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value, by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds nine million seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value."

"(3) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) For foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, an amount of sugar, raw value, equal to the amount determined pursuant to section 201 less the sum of the quotas established pursuant to subsection (a) and (b) of this section.

"(2) For the calendar year 1965, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection among foreign countries on the basis of the quotas established in sugar regulation 811, as amended, issued February 15, 1965 (30 F.R. 2206).

"(3) For the calendar year 1966 through 1971, inclusive, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, Ireland, and the Bahama Islands, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection, less the amounts required to establish quotas as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection for Ireland and the Bahama Islands, among foreign countries on the following basis:

"(A) For countries in the Western Hemisphere:

"Country	Per centum
Cuba	50.00
Mexico	7.73
Dominican Republic	7.56
Brazil	7.56
Peru	6.03
British West Indies	3.02
Ecuador	1.10
French West Indies	.95
Argentina	.93
Costa Rica	.89
Nicaragua	.89
Colombia	.80
Guatemala	.75
Panama	.56
El Salvador	.55
Haiti	.42
Venezuela	.38
British Honduras	.22
Bolivia	.09
Honduras	.09

"(B) For countries outside the Western Hemisphere:

"Country	Per centum
Australia	3.60
Republic of China	1.50
India	1.44
South Africa	1.06
Fiji	.79
Thailand	.33
Mauritius	.33
Malagasy Republic	.17
Swaziland	.13
Southern Rhodesia	.13

"(4) For the calendar year 1966 and each subsequent calendar year, for Ireland, in the amount of five thousand three hundred and fifty-one short tons, raw value, of sugar; and for the calendar year 1968 and each subsequent calendar year, for the Bahama Islands, in the amount of ten thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar: Provided, That the Secretary obtains such assurances from each such country as he may deem appropriate prior to January 1 of each such calendar year that the quota for such year will be filled with sugar produced in such country."

"(4) Subsections (d), (e), and (f) are

hereby amended and subsection (g) is added to read as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

"(1) (A) During the current period of suspension of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba, the quota provided for Cuba under subsection (c) shall be withheld and a quantity of sugar equal to such quota shall be prorated as follows:

"(i) any quantity of quota withheld from Cuba at a determination up to and including the amount of ten million short tons, raw value, under section 201 shall be prorated to other foreign countries named in paragraph (3) of subsection (c) on the basis of the percentages stated therein; and, in addition,

"(ii) any quantity of quota withheld from Cuba at a determination in excess of the amount of ten million short tons, raw value, under section 201, shall be prorated to other foreign countries named in paragraph (3) (A) of subsection (c) that are members of the Organization of American States on the basis of the percentages stated therein.

"(B) Whenever and to the extent that the President finds that the establishment or continuation of a quota or any part thereof for any foreign country would be contrary to the national interest of the United States, such quota or part thereof shall be withheld or suspended, and such importation shall not be permitted. A quantity of sugar equal to the amount of any quota so withheld or suspended shall be prorated to the other countries listed in subsection (c) (3) (A) (other than any country whose quota is withheld or suspended) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries.

"(C) The quantities of sugar prorated pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be designated as temporary quotas and the term "quota" as defined in this Act shall include a temporary quota established under this subsection.

"(2) (A) Whenever the Secretary finds that it is not practicable to obtain the quantity of sugar needed from foreign countries to meet any increase during the year in the requirements of consumers under section 201 by apportionment to countries pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) and the foregoing provisions of this subsection, such quantity of sugar may be imported on a first-come, first-served basis from any foreign country, except that no sugar shall be authorized for importation from Cuba until the United States resumes diplomatic relations with that country and no sugar shall be authorized for importation hereunder from any foreign country with respect to which a finding by the President is in effect under paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection: Provided, That such finding shall not be made in the first nine months of the year unless the Secretary also finds that limited sugar supplies and increases in prices have created or may create an emergency situation significantly interfering with the orderly movement of foreign raw sugar to the United States. In authorizing the importation of such sugar the Secretary shall give special consideration to countries which agree to purchase for dollars additional quantities of United States agricultural products. In the event that the requirements of consumers under section 201 are thereafter reduced in the same calendar year, an amount not exceeding such increase in requirements shall be deducted pro rata from the quotas established pursuant to subsection (c) and this subsection.

"(B) Sugar imported under the authority of this paragraph (2) shall be raw sugar, except that if the Secretary determines that the total quantity is not reasonably available as raw sugar, he may authorize the importation for direct consumption of so much of

October 22, 1965

Mr. President, these things have been bad for the country. We have sown the wind and now we are reaping the whirlwind in the form of demonstrations against our policy in Vietnam.

The American people, through their representatives, should have spoken out against the demonstrations when these demonstrations were in the bud 2 years ago, 3 years ago.

It was utter supineness on the part of the leaders of this country to stand by and watch these demonstrations, and in fact encourage them. Now the chickens have come home to roost.

The demonstrations we are now witnessing and that we are going to see in the near future constitute a potential for mischief making, for harassment of our President and other lawful authorities, far beyond the numbers of those who participate. Whether these agitators and demonstrators are malicious or merely being exploited by Communists and Communist fronts, they should be dealt a sharp rebuff by the American people. Not only that; they should be dealt with severely by the courts of this Nation.

There are encouraging signs that the American people's attitude is stiffening. I see signs that such a movement is already under way. Petitions in support of our American fighting men are being widely circulated throughout the country at various colleges. They are being circulated at West Virginia State College, and student council President Glen Knapp has stated that he aims to get 1,800 signers—The Washington Evening Star, October 20, 1965.

Elsewhere across this great land the true voice at the American people may yet be heard.

Mr. President, praise God that people will yet arise from their apathy and see clearly those who would sell the American heritage for a mess of propaganda pottage.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend very highly the Senator from West Virginia for his very forceful and timely remarks, in which he has analyzed the problem and given us the only solution.

The Senator from West Virginia is a valuable member of our Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, which is in close touch with our fighting men in Vietnam. He has seen many letters we have received, and he himself personally has received letters. He expresses a fine sentiment, which our fighting men richly deserve.

It is not only right, but a patriotic duty on our part to support these men to the limit. They are carrying our flag. They are representing us in trouble spots where blood is being shed and life being lost virtually every hour, certainly every day.

I commend him for his vigilance and his understanding of the problem and his splendid summary. I believe he is sound and thorough in his presentation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I deem it a privilege and high honor to serve on the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the chairman of which is the distinguished

Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I cherish the remarks he has made in my behalf. I know that he shares my concern, as does every other member of that subcommittee, and as does every member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10779) to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex.; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SELDEN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. McVICKER, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. GROSS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes.

ARMY READINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the readiness of our military forces continues to be a matter of utmost importance.

While the current situation in Vietnam has shown some improvement the fact remains we will commit many more new forces and send much more equipment there before the war is stopped or even significantly scaled down.

For that reason it is imperative that we maintain a constant and searching review of our military posture not only in Vietnam but in this country and in all parts of the world where we have men and arms.

Since January, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has been making a special study of Army readiness. We will continue this study on a stepped-up basis as more of our men are sent to Vietnam and others begin accelerated preparation for possible commitment or call-up. On June 25 of this year I reported for the subcommittee the progress of this study to the Senate. Again on July 14 and on August 2, I commented on some of the more important points that had developed from our work. On the 27th of July, the subcommittee unanimously

adopted a classified interim report. A heavily censored version of the transcript of our hearings up to that time was released on September 6.

Since the interim report was adopted and the hearing transcript released, we have continued our inquiry. The staff has now visited 15 of the 16 U.S. Army divisions and many of the other major units of the Army. At this time, staff members are in Vietnam following up on our inquiry. The subcommittee has taken extensive testimony during its hearings and has had access to a mass of classified Army documents.

I want to stress here that all of our information is coming from the Army itself. We accepted and used the readiness rating system established by the Army at the direction of the Secretary of Defense. We have not established our own yardstick to measure readiness but have only used the one the Army developed. The purpose of their readiness rating system was clearly explained by Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the Army, when he appeared before the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, on March 3, 1965, and stated:

During the past year the Army has developed a system of reporting combat readiness in terms of equipment and other factors which is the best we have ever had.

For emphasis, I repeat what General Johnson said about this system of measuring combat readiness. He said:

It is the best we have ever had.

I continue to quote from his description:

This readiness reporting system is a major part of the Army's effort to refine its operations and to improve its techniques. This is an evaluation of the balance of people, training, equipment, and organization in terms of combat readiness against the complex threats we face, the hard facts of resources available, and the diversity of effort expected of the Army.

The Preparedness Subcommittee accepted that definition and made their judgments on the actual conditions of readiness of our Army units on the reports developed under that system. I might add here, staff visits to the units in the field, both before and after the filing of our report, have verified the accuracy of the reporting system.

I recognize that substantial progress has been made since 1961 in modernizing the Army and in increasing the Army divisions both in number and combat readiness.

I am proud of that development. The present Secretary of Defense, his staff, and the members of the military staff are entitled to credit therefor.

However, this was done under a peacetime program and under tight peacetime budgetary restrictions. Events, in the form of hostilities in Vietnam, simply overtook the program. While we have made some progress we still have not met all of the requirements.

Therefore, it is no answer to the problem to simply say that we have the best prepared peacetime Army in our history. This is no longer peacetime and disaster

pressure to halt the present American effort of defending South Vietnam from Communist aggression. The New York Times, on October 20, 1965, reports that an organization which calls itself Students for a Democratic Society has—despite the possibility of prosecution—repeated its determination to step up a program of resistance to the Government's call for military service which will go "far beyond college campuses to neighborhood and draft induction centers." The Times reported that Paul Booth, the national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society had said of the President that "Johnson is trigger happy" and that Booth predicted that "the first places where a new master plan sent out yesterday to the organization's 88 chapters for ratification, would be put into practice would be San Francisco and Ann Arbor, Mich." Two other spokesmen for the organization, Richard Rothstein and Jeff Shero, claimed that Students for a Democratic Society now had 8,000 to 10,000 members, including at least 300 professors.

Whether wittingly or unwittingly, those who are taking part in the planning, the organization, and the staging of the demonstrations, the marches, and the resistance to military service, are engaged in an internal war in the United States. Even though such people represent but a tiny fraction of the American people, their militant posture, their organizational apparatus, and their very vocal presentations make them—in effect, if not in name—auxiliaries of the Communist psychological warfare effort. How such internal warfare techniques could give aid and comfort to Communist policy was spelled out in the Washington Report of the American Security Council as early as June 28, 1965. This form of warfare was analyzed by four of America's leading authorities in the field of psychological warfare, Prof. James D. Atkinson, Prof. Anthony Bouscaren, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, and Mr. Anthony Harrigan. Their analysis is so applicable to the present situation that it deserves to be cited in extenso. They indicated that Communist tactics called for the exploitation of pacifists and other innocent groups, of infiltration of student organizations, of the use of existing Communist fronts, and of the organization of new front or fellow-traveling groups. The objective was to set up bases on college campuses around the Nation and to attempt to build a bridge which would link the leftwing intelligentsia of some universities with the revolutionary groups now found or in process of organization in some of the urban areas of the United States.

And in a prescient forecast of the present situation analysts Atkinson, Bouscaren, Possony, and Harrigan wrote:

The anarcho-Communist alliance intends to move out from those campuses where it is free to operate. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which directed the anti-Vietnam protest in Washington this April, has indicated the next target: manufacturing plants which produce military material. A spokesman for SDS declared that letters have been sent to each chapter, urging sit-ins at such factories. Specific targets are being sought in the production of jets, and nonlethal gas.

In dealing with this new breed of nihilist, the U.S. Government should enforce applicable laws. For example, the Committee for Non-Violent Action has issued a "declaration of conscience" which states: "We encourage those who can conscientiously do so to refuse to serve in the Armed Forces." The committee also stated: "We shall encourage the development of other nonviolent acts, including acts which involve civil disobedience, in order to stop the flow of American soldiers and munitions to Vietnam." It would seem that such statements constitute violations of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which prohibits advising persons facing the draft from refusing to serve their country. Prosecutions under this act are rare, but the time is at hand when the Department of Justice should take action.

It would be a mistake for Americans to dismiss the campus anarchists as a new species of crank. Anyone familiar with Russian history knows that the Communists reap what the nihilists and anarchists sow. These latter had prepared the ground in Russia by destroying public values and introducing lawlessness, agitation and terror. It was on this foundation that the disciplined Bolsheviks were able to build their regime of totalitarian control. The rioters of the 1960's cannot be dismissed as being in the same class as the goldfish swallows or other pranksters of the 1920's and 1930's.

The underlying philosophy of the anarcho-Communist coalition bears a resemblance to the philosophy enunciated by the Chinese Communists. Many of the campus strategists of the revolutionary coalition in this country have a hard line outlook and, like the ChiComs, they seek the psychological stimulation of various key groups to more militant action.

In this connection, one of their prime objectives seems to be to build an axis from campus centers to the depressed areas of our great urban complexes. This summer undoubtedly will find many of the campus revolutionaries at work in extreme leftist groups in the Nation's big cities. A number of organizations already have been created for giving support to those who take part in riots. In New York, the Progressive Labor Movement, which follows the Peking line, has a suborganization in the Committee to Defend Resistance to Ghetto Life (CERGE). The chairman of this committee has been convicted of criminal contempt for refusing to testify before the grand jury investigating the Harlem riots.

In South Vietnam, the Communist Vietcong specialize in development of what they call "combat hamlets"—local centers of resistance to regular government administration. The same pattern seems to be emerging in the United States: an attempt is being made to form combat hamlets, as it were, in the depressed areas of big cities. The aim is to neutralize the local police and to force them to abandon attempts to maintain lawful authority in an urban area. Indeed the plan in the United States seems to be to create in the big cities a network of interlocking political action groups staffed by revolutionaries trained on our college campuses. The end in view is the substitution of a new, synthetic, anarcho-Communist political authority for the legitimate authority of city and State. Observers with vision and understanding of Communist methods in other countries grasp the overall trend of this development—the step-by-step establishment of a Communist state within a State inside this Nation. It is to this end that the revolutionaries seek initial power bases on the campuses and from these to build a bridge to the urban centers.

Even though the present agitators and demonstrators represent but a tiny mi-

nority of the American people, it would be foolish, indeed, ultimately, it might be fatal to ignore them. They constitute a potential for mischiefmaking, for harassment of our President and other lawful authorities far beyond their numbers.

Mr. President, following the recent protests against our policy in Vietnam, many of our national leaders have expressed themselves as being indignant at those protests. They have objected strenuously to the protests. But I was opposed to demonstrations from the beginning. Two or three years ago, the demonstrations which then occurred were not in protest to our activity in Vietnam, but they were nevertheless protests and demonstrations against civil authority. They operated under the innocuous name of civil disobedience. All along I have felt that it was a mistake to countenance them. I believe the old common law which taught us that a criminal act which followed the intent to commit that act constituted a crime.

I feel that the so-called acts of civil disobedience were in reality acts of criminal disobedience. They were crimes, and I think they should have been prosecuted as crimes. I think this should have been done from the beginning. I felt from the beginning that this would plague us and the day would not be far off when any individual who had a complaint would take to the streets with his complaint.

I have always taken pride in the knowledge that this is a nation in which those who seek redress for their wrongs can have their wrongs redressed; a nation operating under a constitutional form of government, where those who do not agree with the laws have constitutional procedures whereby they can work to have those laws repealed or amended.

A long time ago I spoke out against taking the law into one's own hands. I spoke out against the sit-ins, and the wade-ins, and the lie-ins last year when we were debating the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I indicated at that time that I had received bundles of letters urging me to vote for the civil rights bill in order that we might get the demonstrators out of the streets.

I stated on the floor of the Senate then that the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act would not get the demonstrators off the streets; that they would be back on the streets. I saw this come to pass in the early months of this year when the demonstrators indeed were back on the streets.

When the so-called voting rights bill this year was being debated, we heard the same cry—that we should enact the law in order to get the demonstrators out of the streets.

The demonstrators are not out of the streets, and they will not be out of the streets next month or next year.

We have been overly tolerant of these so-called acts of civil disobedience, and many of those in high places have not had the courage to speak out against so-called street demonstrations—blocking of streets, forming of human lines in front of public places of business, exhorting schoolchildren to remain out of schools and participate in the demonstrations.

October 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

27193

and through its extensive networks abroad?

These questions must be answered. The administration must insist on an answer to these questions. The administration must be satisfied with the answers before extending aid. Otherwise, it will most likely seriously impair its relations with the Congress, if it attempts a postadjournment end run on Egyptian economic aid.

The springtime smiles of the State Department, which earlier this year pleaded with the Congress not to tie its hands on aid to the United Arab Republic, have faded.

Mr. President, I urge that the administration delay no further in disclosing its intentions with regard to the United Arab Republic request, and to consult with the leaders of Congress and disclose its decision in this regard to the American people. It is about time that the game of tag on this question between the State Department and the public be brought to an end.

Congress has expressed itself very clearly on this subject.

I join in wanting to give aid to the people of Egypt, provided that we can do it without very seriously hurting ourselves. Hence, questions should be asked and there is an urgent need to have them answered in a satisfactory way and in accordance with the policy of the United States.

I hope that the administration and the State Department will ask these questions and get the right answers before they get their foot further into the trap by giving more aid to Nasser.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article, entitled "Cairo Said To Ask Record U.S. Help," written by Hedrick Smith, published in this morning's New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAIRO SAID TO ASK RECORD U.S. HELP—PUTS 1966 FOOD IMPORT NEEDS AS HIGH AS \$300 MILLION

(By Hedrick Smith)

CAIRO, October 21.—The regime of President Gamal Abdel Nasser, with only 10 weeks supply of wheat and facing the pressures of a steadily expanding population, has asked the United States for a record level of economic aid for 1966, informed sources said today.

The Government of the United Arab Republic has dropped its request for a new 8-year aid agreement with Washington but according to well-placed sources it has told the United States that next year alone the Egyptians will need food imports worth \$250 to \$300 million and hope that the bulk of this will come from the United States.

Last year American surplus food shipments to Egypt under the Food for Peace program reached a peak of \$175 million, but the aid program expired last June 30.

Since then, economic sources say, Egyptian needs, from wheat to tobacco and meat to cooking oil, have continued their sharp rise.

DELEGATION WAS ENCOURAGED

The Egyptian delegation, which returned from high-level talks in Washington last week was given encouragement on the prospects for a new aid agreement, which is expected to be signed soon. But officially

U.S. spokesmen say that President Johnson has not yet given final approval to renewing aid to Egypt.

The time is getting short for the Egyptians. Foreign analysts estimate that Cairo now has enough wheat in hand or en route from other countries to last until the end of December or possibly mid-January.

Since it takes about 2 months to deliver American wheat to Egypt once the President gives the order, Egyptian officials want to sign a new deal with the United States by early next month.

Timing is touchy as well for President Johnson; only last Thursday he received legislation renewing the Food for Peace program. Because of the storm that aid to the United Arab Republic kicked up on Capitol Hill last spring, he presumably wants to wait until Congress adjourns before approving a new aid pact with President Nasser.

The massive list of food requirements that Egyptian officials presented in Washington last week was reported to include 2.7 million metric tons of wheat, compared with 1.5 million in 1964; 650,000 tons of vegetable oils, compared with 425,000 in 1964; and 425,000 tons of other foodstuffs, compared with 300,000 in 1964.

CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The conference report was agreed to.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 30, to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes. The bill was reported with amendments and without recommendation by the Committee on Foreign Relations today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that this is the so-called Interama bill, which provides several million dollars for participation by the United States in a Florida fair?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, although the amount was reduced from \$11 million to \$7,500,000, and from \$4 million to \$2 million; and the period of time was reduced to 2 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This proposal has been advanced for a considerable number of months; in fact, I understand that the idea originated around 1941 or 1942. So it is not anything so world shaking that it must be acted on tonight.

I should certainly like to accommodate my two friends from Florida; but I do not believe enough Senators are present to give the bill sufficient attention at this particular time. Therefore, with great reluctance, I feel constrained to object.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold the objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is true that the idea has been advanced since 1941. In 1950 Congress approved a resolution favoring the whole project.

The Senator from Delaware is well aware of the details; I shall not attempt to bore him or other Senators with them. It is evident that if we are to adjourn sine die tonight and do not get this bill before the Senate tonight, it will, of course, have to go over until next year. The real problem is that, as the Senator well knows, Interama has already issued some \$8 million worth of revenue bonds. We have a commitment from the Community Facilities Administration for some \$22 million.

As the Senator says, everyone knows about it. If everyone knows about it, it seems to me that we ought to be able to vote it up or down. I do not believe there is any new information that either the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Ohio (Mr. LAUSCHE), or any other Member of this body, needs to know in order to make up his mind. I think every Senator is ready to vote on the bill, one way or the other. All we ask is that we be permitted to vote on it at this particular time, this being the last opportunity we shall have at this session to vote on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Florida, and would very much like to accommodate him. It is true, we hope, that we are approaching the end of the session, although I am wondering whether it would not be a good idea to have something for us to look forward to when we come back in January. We have done so much this year that I hardly know whether to say it has been for the people or to the people. I merely wonder if it is not a good time to close up shop and take a good breathing spell to consider many of the measures which we have passed.

I have not seen the final statistics, but I understand that while the President submitted a budget early this year calling for expenditures of \$99.7 or \$99.8 billion, we will have appropriated, when we adjourn tonight, more than \$108 billion, plus a large amount of other approvals for back-door spending. I believe it can truthfully be said that it is time Congress went home. It is long

October 22, 1965

past the time when we should have gone home. We have done enough to the American people for one Congress. Let us go home. Perhaps next year we shall be in a more conservative mood and can do something for them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think there are some facts which may not be known about this important matter. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that he and the Senator from Ohio have argued this subject in great detail on two or three occasions already. It is a matter of simple fairness to allow the bill to come up, to be debated on its merits, and then to be voted up or down by the Senate.

Since the Senator from Delaware has graciously yielded, I wish to place in the RECORD a few facts. The first one is that the State of Florida, the county of Dade, the city of Miami, the city of North Miami, and various utility interests there have donated, granted, or committed more than \$100 million in one way or another to this project. They have committed themselves; and the agency created by State law has committed itself to build, at its own expense, a building for a Federal exhibit and a building for the exhibits of Latin American nations.

I wish to read one item from the bid of the Community Facilities Administration, which was accepted shortly thereafter. The bid from the Community Facilities Administration to the Inter-American Center Authority is dated February 9, 1965. It has to do with the financing of an exhibit of the Federal Government, which was understood to be an absolute necessity if the Latin American nations were to participate. They are to exhibit in buildings to be built by the authority and paid for by local money. I shall read provision J, on page 6 of this proposal dated in February 1965.

The borrower—

That is the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center—

shall covenant in the trust indenture that, in the event an appropriate agency of the U.S. Government does not provide exhibits in the U.S. Government building within a reasonable time after its completion, during any future period when no agency of the U.S. Government occupies said buildings, the authority itself shall occupy said buildings and provide therein exhibits appropriate to the designed characteristics of said buildings and to the concept of the Center.

Mr. President, I wish to make it completely clear that the thing being asked for in the legislation which is presented, and which so far has not been made the pending business, is a payment by the Federal Government for assembling the exhibits for our U.S. Government, and only for that, and for its maintenance during the 2 years after the Center becomes operative. It involves the financing of the Federal exhibit. The building is to be paid for by local people. The building for the other Latin American nations is to be paid for by the local people. The tract of land consists of 1,700 acres. It is worth approximately \$16

million, and has been donated by the people of Miami.

The reclamation of 1,600 acres already reclaimed is paid for. The connection of the water and sewers is being paid for by the city of Miami. The connection of all the various utilities, telephone, gas, electric, and other utility interests is being paid for by the utilities.

The State of Florida is paying between \$6 and \$7 million. All we are asking is that the Federal Government pay for the cost of its own exhibit in this fine, continuing symbol of friendship to bid for better understanding on a cultural and business basis between our country and our Latin American neighbors.

All this is to be done near the center geographically, from the population standpoint, of the Western Hemisphere. It is in the city of Miami.

I want the Senator to recall that our quadracentennial celebration, now underway, is the first in this Nation. It is the first that could take place. It is taking place without the expenditure of one dime by the Federal Government. It is being paid for by the State, by the Spanish Government, by the Catholic Church, and by numerous grants from firms in our Nation which do business in Latin America.

We have received no contribution of any sort from the Federal Government for this first quadracentennial celebration in this country.

In this particular center, an exhibit is designed to bring about greater contact, better friendship, and more cultural understanding between our country and Latin America, at the very place in which some 2 to 3 million Latin Americans come into our country and leave our country to go back home every year. The project has been approved by everyone. Our Federal Government will be represented there.

Is the Senator willing to let the measure come up for debate? The bill would provide for \$9.5 million to be expended over a period of 3 years. This would be made available to carry on the Federal exhibit there. That is the sole purpose for which this building is intended.

I hope that the Senator, having argued at great length on the floor concerning what he regards to be the demerits of the bill, will allow the measure to come up and be passed upon.

I hope that he will be as fair in this case as he was in the case of the Alaskan enterprise which has just been voted on, and the other enterprise.

This project is the only one which I have ever heard of in which the local people have taken part as heavily as they can, and in which they have actually agreed to construct the building in which the Federal exhibit will be located.

I hope that the Senator will be gracious enough to let us call up this measure and work our will upon it.

Bonds have been issued and are outstanding. They had to be sold before the reclamation work could go on. The interest on those bonds is approximately \$20,000 a month. Every month that this project continues to exist without being

put upon a producing basis, there is just that much more expense.

I hope that the distinguished Senator will at least let us debate the measure. The Senator, and others who feel as he does, have argued so extensively today and yesterday, and, in fact, on several other occasions. I hope that he will change his mind.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I again implore the distinguished Senator from Delaware to at least give us an opportunity to vote. I do not propose at this time to set out all the reasons why we think the bill is a good one. The only thing that I wish to state to the able Senator from Delaware is that I think we are entitled to a vote. We have had World Fairs that Senators have voted for. There was one in New York, one in Seattle, Wash. We just voted for one in Alaska. There have been others in the past.

I believe that the people are entitled to have an opportunity to have this matter voted on.

This matter was held up in the Committee on Foreign Relations not by a majority, but by the opposition of two or three Senators. The measure was reported today by a vote of 10 to 4. Four members were opposed to it.

As a practical matter, we are sure that this is the last day on which we shall be discussing anything in this particular session. If we do not vote on Interama now, obviously we cannot consider this matter until next year. We ask that the Senator not change his mind about a single thing concerning the merits of Interama or backtrack on anything or withdraw one word. The Senator can say anything he wishes and vote as he desires and attempt to get anyone else to vote with him. However, we ask that the Senator give us an opportunity to have a vote on this particular bill, which we think is so meritorious.

We ask the Senator to cooperate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations discussed with me early this morning the matter concerning the interest of the two Senators from Florida and others in obtaining action on this measure in the committee.

I was engaged in the Senate in a little friendly discussion on another matter today. I was asked if there would be any objection to a committee meeting. I said that I would certainly not object, that the committee could meet. I said I would give my consent, and, even more than that, I said, "While I am going to vote against this measure, I will go down to help them make a quorum if you need to get action."

I recognized the right of a Senator to get a vote on a bill. However, as the Senator said, the bill came from the committee with a vote of 11 to 4, I believe. Four of us voted against the measure. We have asked for an opportunity to file our minority views. The minority views have been printed or are in the process of being printed.